DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 496 EA 026 199

AUTHOR Pejza, John P.
TITLE Lead, Follow, or Get Out of the Way. Transformational Leadership.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 16p.; Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the National Catholic Educational Association (91st, Anaheim, CA, April 4-7, 1994).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; *Catholic Schools; Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership; *Leadership Styles; Models; *Participative Decision Making; Principals; Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS *Transformational Leadership

ABSTRACT

This paper asserts that traditional leadership models are inappropriate for Catholic schools and offers a new paradigm based on transformational Christian leadership. Christian leadership is a function of the group that is not synonymous with position or authority. Everyone has the potential to be a leader. Such leadership is communal, generative of new leaders, service-oriented, and transformative. The best way to lead is to empower others. Leadership based on the leadership of Christ looks to the entire school community to empower others. Contains 39 references. (LMI)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 375 496

# Lead, Follow or Get Out of the Way

## Transformational Leadership

John P. Pejza, O.S.A.

President

Villanova Preparatory School

Ojai, California

Paper Presented at the

National Catholic Educational Association Convention

Anaheim, California

April 4, 1994

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Pejza

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 026 199

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Lead, follow, or get out of the way

*Lead, follow, or get out of the way*. Lee Iacocca used that phrase a couple of years ago to try to convince people to buy Chrysler cars. There's no question that Iacocca was able to turn that company around, and because of that a lot of people consider him as an outstanding business leader.

Leadership is a topic which currently is of great interest to many people. A lot of universities are putting in programs in leadership. You can find any number of books on the subject in any bookstore. It's a hot topic.

When I first discussed the leadership of the principal at the NCEA Convention ten years ago, it was pretty clear to me what a leader should be. After all, I had some experience as a principal; I'd taken some courses on leadership and had read up on the subject. The convention that year was in St. Louis. Therefore, as someone from out of town, I automatically became an expert on the subject.

### Traditional views of leadership

What exactly is leadership? We tend to use the word, "leadership," in a couple of ways. Very often it refers to the search for excellence. A lot of advertisements use the word in this sense, such as "Ford provides leadership in the auto industry because quality is important to us."

Or we use the word to refer to the people who are in office, for instance, the senate leadership. We also use it to refer to what a person does to a group of people in an organization: a principal gives leadership to the faculty. There really isn't a great deal of agreement out there as to what leadership is, and that's one of the problems. We need to be more precise when referring to leadership. (Rost, 1991)

Ten years ago, I presumed that the principal was automatically the leader of the school community. After all, he or she was the one with the authority, the power to make decisions. She hired or fired teachers and made decisions affecting the finances and future of the school. She developed a personal vision of her ideal school and worked hard to achieve that goal. I expected the principal, as the leader of the school, to communicate her vision so dynamically that others would jump at the opportunity of working toward it. As the educational leader of the school, the principal was expected to be extremely knowledgeable. She always had the right answers for the most pressing problems. She was a self-disciplined, take-charge individual who showed initiative, with determination and persistence in pursuing her goals. (Murphy, 1988)

### Failings of the traditional model

As I gained more experience as a principal, and as I studied leadership more, I came to realize that only a very small handful of individuals possess all or any of the qualities which great leaders are supposed to have. There aren't many people in positions of authority who have the extraordinary vision of a Henry Ford or a Thomas Jefferson. The idealized portrait that we have painted of "The Leader" often ignores the ordinary give and take of everyday

life.

We have viewed the principal as a symbol of the aspirations of the school community. He has stood ahead of them, like one who has already accomplished the goal to a large extent, and who now acts as a focal point drawing others to the realization of the same goal. The principal stands with his face toward the internal school community, drawing them onward. But at the same time he is the corporate face of the school community, and serves as the representative of the school to outsiders. (Sheets, 1972)

In real life, a principal doesn't dream up a vision of the ideal school all by himself. The way that a person ordinarily develops a vision is through discussion and argument with others. They ask questions; they listen; they come to realize that their ideas are not always perfect. They learn to cope with their own and the organization's weaknesses. A wise principal leans heavily on the intuition and understanding of others. She realizes that it doesn't serve any purpose to formulate a vision in isolation, only to find out that no one in the school community has bought into this picture. (Murphy, 1988)

Every modern organization, from General Motors to St. Philomena's Parish School, is a complex organism. It's unrealistic to assume that one person, despite her intelligence and experience, can have knowledge and control over every aspect of the organization. And yet that is what the traditional models of leadership assume.

Because of these insights, I came to realize that the conventional descriptions of leadership really don't work. We have set up artificial and unrealistic standards for leadership. It thus becomes easy to believe that leadership is a rare commodity, enjoyed only by a privileged few. We think of people like General George Patton, storming across Europe during World War II. Or Winston Churchill, inspiring the English people to sacrifice "blood, sweat, and tears" to win the Battle of Britain. We have come to view the leader as the "Great Man" (and I use the term deliberately, since few women were ever considered), someone significantly shaping the course of history. (Foster, 1989)

It's easy, with such a mindset, to believe that the ordinary individual can't possibly be a leader. Knowing their frailties, many individuals don't even consider the possibility that they could lead.

Traditional models have identified leadership with good management. As Bennis and Nanus (1985) have pointed out, the difference between these two is critical. *"Managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing."* (Bennis and Nanus, 1985)

No one denies that good management makes life easier in an school. All of us want the school to run smoothly, with order and predictability. We want the bells to ring on time. (Rost, 1991) But good management alone is not leadership. Management is an authority relationship aimed at producing and selling goods and/or services through the coordination of efforts by managers and subordinates. Leadership, however, is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes. (Rost, 1991)

**Traditional models are inappropriate for Catholic schools**

Another insight that I have gained over the years is that the long-standing models of

leadership are not appropriate for Catholic schools.

1) Traditional views of leadership are based either on political or business models. Someone like Lee Iaccoca is a great business leader if he can increase the productivity of his company. The president of a company is viewed as a business leader if he can push his workers to higher levels of performance. We view a business leader as a great man with certain outstanding traits who influences followers to do what he wants in order to achieve group/organizational goals. In this view, strongly espoused by Tom Peters and his followers, excellence really is defined as some kind of higher-level effectiveness. (Rost, 1991)

But is this necessarily what a Catholic school is all about - getting students to earn higher grades or better SAT scores, or increasing the enrollment of the school? What about a greater sense of Christian community, or of working to remedy social ills such as poverty or injustice? How do you factor these into the traditional equation for a good leader?

2) In business or in the military, a leader relies heavily upon the authority and power that he has. He can coerce people into acting in a particular way - "Either do it my way or you're fired or court-martialed." This can lead to ruthless power-wielding. In such a situation, there are no followers, only subordinates. Again, does this reflect the communitarian nature of our schools?

3) The moral values that the traditional models of leadership propound are not necessarily Christian. Michael Douglas's character in the movie, *Wall Street*, extolled the idea that "Greed is good." As Bellah *et al* pointed out in *Habits of the Heart* (1985), our society glorifies the individual above all. The one who gets ahead in any field is the one who is extolled and admired as a leader. But when people push the rights and priorities of individuals to the fore, they undermine the responsibility of the individual to the community. (Murphy, 1993) Again, is this characteristic of Catholic schools?

**Characteristics of Christian leadership**

So for a variety of reasons I have discarded the traditional models of leadership. I'm not alone in doing this. A whole new school has developed in recent years to explore the real nature of leadership. Instead of concentrating on one individual in a position of authority, leadership is related to the dynamics of inter-relations within an organization. What I'd like to do is state some of the premises which form the basis for this new paradigm of leadership.

**1. Leadership is not synonymous with position (or authority)**

Earlier this season a sitcom called **Bakersfield P.D.** portrayed a local police chief as someone with no leadership ability whatsoever. He just couldn't make a decision, whether it was the choice between jelly or glazed doughnuts, or how to deploy his forces in a stakeout. His sergeant really ran the department and was the real leader of the force.

Many of us have been in schools where the principals have shown less than stellar qualities of leadership. We know from experience that putting someone in the principal's chair doesn't automatically make him a leader. And yet, traditionally the principal is considered the leader of the school community. We have confused leadership with the person in charge.

A principal certainly has authority, the right to command given by reason of office. A principal has the ability to suspend a student for misconduct or to assign a teacher to lunch duty. That teacher might do that task only because she has been ordered to do so. Power wielding, certainly, but is this leadership?

Most of the time, relationships within a school faculty are not based on authority, but rather on the interdependence of teacher and principal. A cause and effect relationship is not always a straight-line relationship: more often it is circular: "You scratch my back, I'll scratch yours." (Allen, 1989) We do something because we perceive that we will derive some benefit from it, not just because we are ordered to do so.

**2. Leadership is a function of the group, not of an individual**

The premise that leadership is not a function of position suggests that ultimately leadership belongs to the community. Leadership doesn't exist in a vacuum. You have to have a group of people before you can have leadership. You can't have a leader without followers, or followers without a leader.

We tend to think of followers as passive individuals who are not involved in decision making. We view them as sheep, going wherever the shepherd leads them. But in this new view of leadership, a follower is an active participant, not just a spectator. Each member of a group contributes to the goals of the group. The influence which each exerts on the group is part of leadership (Meissner, 1972)

One person may eventually be recognized as the leader in a particular situation, but in reality, various members of the community contribute to the process of moving the organization forward. The designation as leader is only a temporary designation. Leadership is shared and transferred between leaders and followers. Leaders and followers become interchangeable. (Foster, 1989)

Chakedis compares an organization to the universe, in which galaxies and stars form a dynamic swirl of energy. Leadership is located throughout the swirl, expressing the vision and guaranteeing the identity and growth of the organization as it goes through its inevitable passages of change and instability. (Chakedis, 1993) Looking at it in another way, leadership is holographic, that is, it is embedded in every individual in the organization. (Allen, 1989)

St. Paul certainly subscribed to the idea that leadership belongs to the group. "
There is a variety of gifts, but always the same Spirit; there are all sorts of service to be done, but always the same Lord, working in all sorts of different ways in different people. It is the same God who is working in all of them. The particular way in which the Spirit is given to each person is for a good purpose." (1 Cor 12:4-7)

If this view of school leadership is correct, then why do accounts of visionary principals continue to populate the literature about effective schools? Three reasons have been suggested: first, there certainly are extraordinary visionaries who dominate their schools, just as people like Churchill or Franklin Roosevelt dominated their political environments. But others believe that these individuals simply take advantage of "
corridors of belief"
which already exist in followers. They enter these corridors and open various doors. (Foster, 1989)

Secondly, there is the "treachery of recollection." People recall what they want to. Instead of recalling the give and take of faculty discussion and negotiation, they remember only the instances where the principal did something memorable.

Lastly, people who are interviewed often say what society expects them to say. Since our society expects leaders to have a clear sense of purpose, they conclude that their principal articulated such a vision, but they perhaps just missed it. (Murphy, 1988)

**3. Everyone has the potential to be a leader, at least some of the time**

A person may be a leader for a time within a group, but it doesn't mean that the same individual will be a leader in all situations and forever. (Foster, 1989) A person's leadership depends on their relationship with followers. As time moves on, those relationships change.

There is a life span to leadership. Like any living thing, it is born, it grows, declines, dies, and is replaced with the leadership of another person. (Sheets, 1972) Moses didn't enter the promised land; instead he handed over the leadership to Joshua. Today's leader is tomorrow's follower.

There are some who believe that the model of a single leader is declining in favor of a coalition of leaders who act together and divide various leadership functions among themselves. (DeKeersgieter, 1985) Some communities of religious women which have essentially adopted this model for the governance of their institutes. I have heard of schools in which a leadership team of three to five persons sets policy and courses of action, even though nominally one is the principal. Informally this method of leadership often takes place when assistant principals or department chairs or even individual teachers become responsible for curricular decisions through their informal, hidden or unauthorized influence. Top administrators often provide the scaffold for collaboration rather than the blueprint for action. (Murphy, 1988)

Instead of considering the principal as the educational leader of the school, perhaps we should see teachers as the logical instructional leaders in a school, since it is by their decisions that policy and practice are meshed. (Rallis, 1988)

Everyone should have the opportunity to lead if they desire. Some individuals, of course, choose to be followers all the time, or divorce themselves completely from any leadership relationships. Other people are not motivated to be leaders, do not have the skills needed to be leaders, or are unwilling to use their resources to lead.(Rost, 1991) This does not, however, rule out their potential ability to lead on some occasions.

**4. Leadership is communal and shared; it requires trust and cooperation**

It's difficult getting teachers to work together. We're all used to our self-contained classrooms; we ordinarily work alone. We aren't accustomed to spending time with colleagues hammering out a unified plan for the school. Therefore it is difficult to get a group of teachers to work together. (Rallis, 1988)

As part of this new model of leadership, we need to look at the relationships which exist between members of a school community. The formal network of connections among teachers

and administrators, between students and teachers, between parents and administrators, - and the informal web of relationships which exist - can have profound influences on the school.

Catholic tradition focusses more on the community than on the individual. As members of the Body of Christ, we come to realize that we are dependent on one another. St. Paul said it best: "Just as each of us has one body with many members, and not all the members have the same function, so too we, though many, are one body in Christ and individually members one of another." (Rom 12:4-5)

If a group is going to work together, certain characteristics are essential: compromise, teamwork, group vision, collaboration, concern for one another - all of these must be developed if a group is fully to assume its proper leadership role.

**5. Leadership is generative**

Jesus sent his disciples out to proclaim his message. He empowered them to preach the Good News. He turned the reins over to them.

A school constantly has to generate new leaders if it wants to remain active and vital. Leadership demands a continual renewal. (Sheets, 1972) A good leader passes on to the next leader the ideas and ideals which have driven him or her. A leader should prepare the soil for developing leadership abilities in others. In this way, leadership becomes a shared and communal process. (Foster, 1989)

Centuries ago, the Chinese philosopher Lao Tse wrote, "A leader is best when people barely know he exists. He is not so good when people obey and acclaim him. He is worse when they despise him. But of a good leader who talks little when his work is done, his aim fulfilled, they will say, 'We did it ourselves.'" In the same vein, the American social commentator, Walter Lippman, once said "The final test of a true leader is that he leaves behind him in others the conviction and will to carry on."

People in authority sometimes are reluctant to turn over the reins to followers. Giving up power does involve a sense of loss or defeat. They need to realize that by sharing their leadership, they deepen the faculty's commitment and thus enhance the school's future.

**6. Leadership is service**

The Son of Man came not to be served but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many.

The ultimate purpose of leadership is to serve. The leader enables followers to take the lead. (Byron, 1980) St. Augustine put it this way: "I am a Christian for my own sake, whereas I am a leader for your sake; the fact that I am a Christian is to my own advantage, but I am a leader for your advantage." He also said, "You serve Christ well if you serve those whom Christ has served."

Self-fulfillment comes from service to others. (Murphy, 1993) I would suggest that you read, if you haven't already done so, Greenleaf's classical work on *Servant leadership*. (Greenleaf, 1977).

**7. Leadership is about transformation**

As human beings, we try to develop structures which support us and those around us. We try to fill mutual needs; we look for practices which provide comfort and protection. We build a culture to safeguard the basic assumptions which our group has developed to cope with the world around us. We teach this pattern of behavior, which we call a culture, to newcomers as the correct way to perceive, think and feel about these problems. (Schein, 1985).

It is hard to change a culture. The principles which hold a group together can become very strong. The history of a school governs a lot of what goes on there. We become both victims and beneficiaries of this tradition. A strong culture can close down many options for change, but it does provides meaning and a sense of order. (Foster, 1989) It can however lead to stagnation.

And that's where leadership comes in. Leadership *is* change. Without change there is no leadership. Leadership is the antithesis of the *status quo*. (Foster, 1989) There has to be a change, a transformation, if the vitality and quality of life of the school is to blossom. (Chrispeels, 1989)

Sometimes we expect the person in charge to be the one who organizes everything. In a recent newspaper column, Tom Peters stressed that's not the way it should be. The person in authority should be the main *disorganizer*. He said, "Everybody 'manages' quite well; whenever anything goes wrong, they take immediate action to make sure nothing will go wrong again. The problem is, nothing new will every happen, either." (Peters, 1994)

In other words, change comes about when a leader realizes that there is need for change. That is followed by a search for ways to accomplish that change, and a determination to make the change a new reality. (Murphy, 1993) In other words, a school leader analyzes a situation; comes up with a vision of a better school; commits himself to that vision; and then inspires followers to work to reach it.

**Analysis**

Sooner or later in every organization, someone becomes frustrated with the *status quo*, with the existing culture. Perhaps new problems have arisen - our way of dealing with a situation is no longer effective because of societal changes. Or relationships within the faculty have been altered because of the presence of new teachers.

Someone who's dissatisfied with a situation can react in different ways: they can walk away from it; they can do nothing; or they can take action to change the situation. That's when the spark of leadership is kindled.

When someone compares the history and purpose of a school with its present situation, disparities can be detected. The current problem or weakness can be pinpointed with its causes and possible cures. Analysis is the first step to change.

**Vision**

Analysis of the weaknesses of present conditions won't bring about change within an school. The leader has to come up with a vision of alternative possibilities, what could be.

This can be a tricky process. The culture of a school is fixed in place. People don't

ordinarily want to change it. The vision needs to be dynamic enough to melt the existing mold so that change can occur. Even though the vision might be articulated by only one person, it can't remain just one person's dream of a better school. It has to eventually be embraced by the entire community if it is to become a reality.

People view vision in different ways. George Bush was often faulted for lacking " the vision thing." The new IBM president, recruited from outside the firm, stated, " The last thing IBM needs now is vision - we have to get back to basics." (Cunniff, 1993)

Vision means seeing a better way of carrying out the mission of a school. Vision is essential to avoid stagnation and eventual deterioration. The Old Testament indicates that " people without a vision shall perish." (Barth, 1988) Without a vision, a group will simply move along, putting out fires, not changing a whole lot, but simply stagnating.

**Commitment to a plan**

Whoever has arrived at a vision needs to commit themself to that ideal, if it is to come to fruition. The leader has to be willing to commit his or her resources to accomplish the goal. The leader has to be willing to put a lot on the line to ensure that the vision is reached.

Commitment bonds leaders to their people in a community of mutual purpose and support. "United we stand; divided we fall." Forward motion will occur only when the group decides to move.

**Inspiration**

A leader has to get people to own the vision. Very often we think of this as charismatic leadership. But it doesn't just belong to the handful of those who are charismatic; it has to be an integral part of any leader's task. People have to feel that what is proposed is worthwhile and realizable.

There's a sort of chicken and egg relationship which exists here. Which comes first: trust in a leader or commitment to a vision? Before individuals will commit themselves to a vision, they must trust that the leader is worth following. But often before they can put that trust in a leader, they need to commit themselves to the vision which has been presented.

The leader has to inspire confidence among followers in their leadership and vision, but they must also build everyone's trust in each other and in themselves. (Murphy, 1993)

**What is leadership?**

What then is leadership in this new model? According to one scholar, it is an influence relationship between leaders and followers who intend real change that reflects their mutual purposes. (Rost, 1991) Another definition the leader is one who mobilizes others toward a goal shared by leader and followers. (Wills, 1994)

Leadership is based on influence, not on authority. A leader persuades others to follow. He uses power resources, such as his interpersonal and group skills, prestige, personality, perception, and status to influence others. The leader does not impose his will on the followers

but inspires them to follow.

Leaders and followers are involved in an active relationship. Those relationships can change: a person can be a leader in one group and a follower in another. Since leadership is a relationship, both leader and followers do leadership. They are in the relationship together. The relationship is inherently unequal because the leader uses more of their power resources to the relationship. But followers do not have to be leaders to convince others of the merit of the proposed changes.

Both parties in the relationship have to intend real changes which reflect their mutual purposes. Leaders and followers have to follow through by their words and actions on the changes they propose. The intended changes can't be superficial, but must be substantive and transforming. The leader and followers mutually hammer out the purposes which they have in mind. "The mutual purposes become common purposes because followers and leaders engage in leadership together." (Rost, 1991)

**A new paradigm of Catholic school leadership**

Following this new model of leadership, it is my belief that we need to formulate a new paradigm of Catholic school leadership. This new model needs to be in accord with the leadership of Christ. I came across an essay on leadership and authority by Jesuit John Sheets which provided some insights which I believe can be used as a first cut of such a new paradigm.

Sheets said God draws all things to himself in two ways: he attracts us by his goodness and he compels us to obey his will. In a vein reminiscent of Teilhard de Chardin, he said the whole world comes to a convergent unity through God's attractiveness and through his commanding.

God shares these powers with humans. Leadership, according to Sheets, is the sharing in God's goodness to attract. Authority is the sharing in his power to command. Each is necessary. God's goodness moves the world which also lies under the compelling influence of God.God not only provides for us, but he also gives us the ability to share in his power to provide for others.

In this view, Jesus Christ provides God for us and us for God. Divine providence is realized through Christ. He is the embodiment of God's attractive goodness and is the one who transmits the divine imperative. Christ leads us to his Father by attracting us to himself. He goes before us, drawing us to himself. Jesus is supreme leader in every sense, as the Letter to the Hebrews indicates: "Let us not lose sight of Jesus, who leads us in our faith and brings it to satisfaction."

Whenever someone is drawn to accomplish some good, then Christ's leadership is present. Leadership in the Church, in this model, is a sharing in, an extension of, the leadership of Christ. The church leader helps someone to achieve greater unity with God and with each another. Leadership is sacramentalized in the Church, by being found wherever the attractiveness of Christ becomes present and visible in a person. The leader can draw on a new power, the power of the Holy Spirit. (Sheets, 1972)

These ideas need to be expanded upon, so that current thinking on leadership is imbued with Christian ideals.

**How to get a group to exercise leadership**

How do you shift gears? How do you get a faculty to abandon the traditional model of leadership and realize that leadership lies in their hands? It's not easy to do this because we have all grown up thinking and acting as if leadership is invested solely in the principal.

There hasn't been a whole lot written on "how to" methods. More and more, however, people are realizing that we must find ways of bringing about such changes if we are to move to the new Christian model.

Mark Twain once said that to do good and treat people fairly is noble. To tell others to do good and treat people fairly is also noble - and much less trouble. It's the same with good and poor leaders. The poor leader tells others to do the task; the good leader shows followers how to do it. The principal can't just order that the entire faculty show leadership.

Attempts to force cultural changes usually only creates wild cultures. Efforts to change the outward signs of a culture - the symbols, rituals, and stories which exist in a organization - ordinarily has little effect on the values and basic assumptions which govern the actions of members. (Fink, 1989)

On the other hand, simply allowing leadership to crop up without any relationship to authority can be disastrous. Witness the example of Martin Luther, who certainly showed leadership but without the authority of the Church to back up his proposed reforms (Sheets, 1972)

The culture of a school changes significantly when experienced teachers stop functioning in isolation and start solving problems related to student learning collectively. (Liebermann, 1988) For this to happen, teachers must be empowered to act collectively.

It seems to me that the best way to lead is to empower others. A leader does this by finding ways for all members of the community to participate in shaping a school's values, goals and procedures for attaining those goals (Liebermann, 1988) Leaders need to create an environment that helps people to discover their skills and talents. Teachers have to be enabled not controlled. (DeKeersgieter, 1985) A suitable climate within the school must be created to allow for the growth of ideas. Teachers have to have the freedom to experiment; there must be a willingness on the part of administration to share the responsibility for the failures which will inevitably occur (Barth, 1988) The faculty has to be encouraged to talk about the organizational history, organizational purpose and the distribution of organizational power. (Foster, 1989)

A good example of community leadership is a typical volunteer organization, such as a school parent group. They are all volunteers. A member can join or leave freely. Leaders change on a regular basis. The vitality of the group depends on how well it develops leadership of committee chairpersons, since they ordinarily move up to the leadership of the organization. These organizations meet people where they are and work to develop them. (Allen, 1989)

There are costs associated with group leadership, time and autonomy being among the greatest. The group gains power, but individual teachers very often lose the power they enjoy in their own classroom. Shared decisions could include sharing power, not just with colleagues, but also with parents, students and community members. Teachers sometimes are unwilling to let themselves become vulnerable. (DeKeersgieter, 1985)

It's easy for a principal to make a decision which affects the school community. It's a lot harder and more time consuming for a group to reach consensus on some issue.

## Conclusion

*Lead, follow, or get out of the way*. I have tried to show that all members of a school community can lead in specific areas, and that followership are leadership are interchangeable. I hope that you agree that everyone in a school community has to do more than get out of the way if authentic leadership is to be developed in a school.

Leadership is essential if any school is to continue to grow. In our schools that leadership must be based on the leadership of Jesus Christ.

Leadership cannot be developed solely by reading books or listening to a talk. You have to practice it to get it to work. It can be learned. The leader's task is to stimulate the group through its own discernment process to an awareness of its own resources. (Arbuckle, 1985)

All too long we have viewed the one in charge, the principal, the pastor, the chairman of the school board, as "the leader." I am convinced that we need to look beyond these few individuals to the entire school community for leadership. That will not occur, however, unless those in authority are willing to empower others to take on the mantle of leadership. It is my hope that all our schools will make the effort to develop leadership. All in our Christian school communities need to feel that they can provide leadership. In this way, our schools will continue to grow in the image of Christ.

### References

Allen, K.E. (1989, March 11). *Multiple level leadership: or What if God is a mouse?* Paper presented at Leadership: Ten years After: A conference at the University of San Diego.

Arbuckle, G.A. (1984, Nov.-Dec). General government: Its leadership role today. *Review for Religious, 43* (6), pp. 820-841.

Arbuckle, G.A. (1985). Innovations in religious life. *Human Development, VI* (3), pp. 45-49.

Arbuckle, G.A. (1985, March-April). Provincials as "Cultural Revolutionaries": The role of provincial superiors today. *Review for Religious, 44* (2), pp. 175-190.

Barth, R.S. (1988, May). Principals, teachers, and school leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69* (9), pp. 639-642.

Belasco, J.A. & Stayer, R.C. (1993). *Flight of the Buffalo: Soaring to excellence, learning to let employees lead.* New York: Warner.

Bellah, R.N. Madsen, R., Sullivan, W.M., Swidler, A., and Tipton, S.M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life.* Berkeley: University of California.

Bennis, W. and Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge.* New York: Harper & Row.

Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Burns, H.M. (1992, Sept. 17). Leadership: Making new paths for others to walk in. *Origins, 22* (14), pp. 241-246.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Byron, W.J. (1980). The purpose and nature of leadership. *New Catholic World*, pp. 205-208.

Chakedis, V. (1994, Fall). Jurassic Park and you. *Innovating*, *4* (1), pp. 3-14.

Chrispeels, J. (1989, March 11). Leadership in the middle. Paper presented at Leadership: Ten years after: A conference at the University of San Diego, 1989.

Coughlan, D. (1988, Jan-Feb). Collaborative leadership in apostolic ministry: Behavior and assumptions. *Review for Religious,47*, pp. 47-55.

Cunniff, J. (1993, August 20). Opposing factions at IBM unsure about firm's direction. Ventura (CA) Star Free Press, pg. C1.

Davies, J.S. (1989, March 11) Transformational leadership: Promises and problems for a new school of leadership. Paper presented at Leadership: Ten years After: A conference at the University of San Diego.

DeKeersgieter, P. (1985, December). The case for "power with" leadership style, *Momentum*, pp. 55-56.

Fink, R.A. (1988, April). Leadership, culture, and change on the college campus. *Campus Activities Programming*, pp. 65-69.

Fink, R.A. (1989). Vision: An essential component of leadership. In *Leadership: Ten years after: A series of papers on the subject of leadership by students and graduates*, University of San Diego, CA

Foster, W. F. (1989). Toward a critical practice of leadership, in J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership*, (pp. 39-62). London: Falmer.

Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist.

Grob, L. (1984). "Leadership: The Socratic Model." In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 263-280) . Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lieberman, A. (1988, May). Teachers and principals: Turf, tension, and new tasks. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *69* (9), pp. 648-653.

Meissner, W.W. (1972, March). Comments after the introduction. *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*, *IV* (2), pp. 76-78.

Murphy, E.C. with M. Snell. (1993). The genius of Sitting Bull: Thirteen heroic strategies for today's business leaders. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Murphy, J.T. (1988, May). The unheroic side of leadership: Notes from the swamp. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *69* (9), pp. 654-659.

Owens, R.G. (1987). The leadership of educational clans. in L.T. Sheive and M.B. Schoenheit (Eds.) , *Leadership: Examining the elusive* (pp. 16-29). ASCD.

Peters, T. (1994, March 6). Mess as message contains lessons. Ventura (CA) Star Free Press, pg. E6.

Rallis, S. (1988, May). Room at the top: Conditions for effective school leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *69* (9), pp. 643-647.

Rost, J.C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Praeger: Westport, CT.

Schein, E.H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shanker, A. (1988, March 30). Where we stand: Teachers have leadership role. *Education Week*.

Sheets, J.R. (1972, March) A discussion on leadership and authority. *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*, *IV* (2), pp. 53-76.

Skalbeck, K.L. (1989, March 11). The nature of leadership: Promises and problems for a future school of leadership. Paper presented at Leadership: Ten years after: A conference at the University of San Diego.

Thomson, S.D. (1986, May 28). Strengthen, don't diffuse school leadership. *Education Week*, pp. 22, 28.

Wills, G. (1994). *Certain trumpets: The call of leaders*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Wright, J.H. (1972, March). Comments after the introduction. *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits*, pp. 80-81.

This new leadership has the same intent as that of Christ. "
In your minds you must be the same as Christ Jesus (Phil 2:5).
[ Because of the incarnation and redemption, all leadership and authority are "
in the Lord."
There is no such thing as purely secular leadership or authority. The unity to which they lead is "
in the Lord."
All leadership is "
baptized."
Leadership is the extension of Christ's own drawing.

Because of being in Christ, his values subsume all values. The ultimate value is having the holiness that comes from communion with the Son. The drama of St. Paul's conversion takes place in every Christian in a genuine but perhaps undramatic way. ]

[ As a community of believers, we find in Jesus our common attraction and our common Lord. The total force of God's goodness is rendered attractive in the body of Christ. "
And when I am lifted up from the earth, I shall draw all men to myself.y30
(John 12:32). All authority in some way transmits the imperative to take on the image of the Son. All genuine leadership draws us to that image. [ To some extent leadership depends on the natural gifts of an individual - intelligence, vivacity, goodness - and the extent to which these gifts serve as a focal point for drawing others.]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE